



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/522,161

09/30/2005

Charles Tellier

0512-1258

3550

466 7590 11/27/2009
YOUNG & THOMPSON
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

GROSS, CHRISTOPHER M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1639

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/27/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DocketingDept@young-thompson.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/522,161	Applicant(s) TELLIER ET AL.	
	Examiner CHRISTOPHER M. GROSS	Art Unit 1639	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,7-15,19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,7-15 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Responsive to communications entered 9/24/2009 Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-15, and are pending. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-15, 19 are under consideration.

The petition filed 7/10/2009 (granted 11/18/2009) was mailed 11/19/2009). The response filed 24 September 2009 has been treated as a response to a nonfinal office action. This office action assesses the 24 September 2009 response as set forth below.

Priority

The present application filed was 9/30/2005 and is a 371 of PCT/FR03/02318 filed 07/22/2003.

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) to French application 02/09456 (referred to as '456) filed 07/25/2002. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Applicant has perfected priority to '456 by filing a certified and verified English translation of '456 on 1/9/2008.

Response to Declarations

The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 entered 9/24/2009 is insufficient to overcome the rejections of claims 1,2,4,7-15,19 under 35 USC 102 (f) and 35 USC 103(a) as set forth in the last Office action because:

The declaration entered 9/24/2009 addresses the issues raised in the office action mailed 6/24/2009 on p 3 sections (a) and (b) concerning authorization given to Bruno Bujoli by the remaining present inventors. It noted, however, none of the declarations in the instant case address p 3 section (a) of the last office action. To

reiterate, while the 37 CFR 1.132 declaration entered 3/31/2009 by Bruno Bujoli provides evidence that Pascal Janvier and Isa Benitz did not conceive the presently claimed subject matter, it does not indicate whether the other authors of the Envelope Soleau (verified English translation entered 1/9/2008) made contributions to reduction to practice. In other words, no indication is given whether Pascal Janvier and Isa Benitz were merely working under the direction of the present co-inventors of the claimed subject matter.

Maintained Claim Rejection(s) – 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

Claims 1,2,4,7-15,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter for the reasons set forth in the office action mailed 12/31/2008.

Response to Arguments

On p 2-3 of applicant's remarks entered 9/24/2009, applicant asserts the 37 CFR 1.131 and 1.132 declarations entered 3/31/2009 and 9/24/2009 provide evidence that the currently claimed subject matter was not invented by Pascal Janvier and Isa Benitz. However, for the reasons discussed above, none of the declarations in the instant case are sufficient with regard to whether Pascal Janvier and Isa Benitz made contributions toward reduction to practice.

Maintained Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

.

Claims 1, 4, 7-15, 2 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Agrawal et al**, (WO 2003/046508 A2) in view of **Petruska, et al**, (Thin Solid Films, 327-329 (1998) 131-135, Elsevier Science) and **Lockhart et al**, (US Patent 5,556,752) , and further in view of **Gagna et al**, US Patent 6,936,461 (Date of Patent 30 August 2005) for the reasons set forth in the office action mailed 12/31/2008.

Response to Arguments

On p 4-5 of applicant's remarks entered 9/24/2009, applicant asserts the 37 CFR 1.131 declaration entered 1/9/2008, 37 CFR 1.132 declarations entered 3/31/2009 and 9/24/2009, all concerning the Envelope Soleau filed 4/30/2001 (akin to a French Provisional Application; verified English translation entered 1/9/2008) provides evidence the claimed subject matter was invented by BRUNO BUJOLI, CHARLES TELLIER, MURIEL PIPELIER, DIDIER DUBREUIL and DANIEL TALHAM prior to the 102(e) dates of Agrawal et al and Gagna et al.

However, for the reasons discussed above, the declarations and Envelope Soleau are insufficient in discounting the contributions Pascal Janvier and Isa Benitz.

Since the response filed 3 September 2009 has been treated as a response to a nonfinal, the current action treated all items in the response as part of a response to a nonfinal action the finality of this action is appropriate.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER M. GROSS whose telephone number is (571)272-4446. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low can be reached on 571 272 0951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1639

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christopher M Gross
Examiner
Art Unit 1639

cg

/ Christopher S. F. Low /
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1639